

In its opinion denying Relators’ motion for intervention, ECF No. 67, this Court did not overlook any settled law. There has been no intervening change in the law, and no new evidence not previously available has emerged. Relators did not present anything in the motion for reconsideration that they did not present before—nothing is being said now that was not said then. As a result, this motion for reconsideration is denied. *See North River Ins. Co. v. CIGNA Reins. Co.*, 52 F.3d 1194, 1218 (3d Cir. 1995); *Max’s Seafood Cafe ex rel. Lou-Ann v. Quinteros*, 176 F.3d 669, 677 (3d Cir. 1999); *Buffa v. N.J. State Dep’t of Judiciary*, 56 Fed. App’x 571, 575 (3d Cir. 2003); *Gutierrez v. Ashcroft*, 289 F. Supp. 2d 555, 561 (D.N.J. 2003); Charles A. Wright, Arthur R. Miller & Mary Kay Kane, *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 2810.1 (3d ed. 2013).

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

CONCLUSION

Relators' motion for reconsideration is denied. An appropriate order follows.

Date: July 22, 2014

/s/ William H. Walls
United States Senior District Judge